

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Water Protection Bureau

Environmental Assessment

Name of Project: City of Harlowton, Wastewater Treatment Facility

Location of Project: 46° 25' 44.5" N latitude, 109° 48' 05" W longitude

City/Town: Harlowton

County: Wheatland

Description of Project: This is a reissuance of an MPDES permit MT0020354 for the City of Harlowton Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) which discharges treated domestic wastewater to the Musselshell River. The WWTF consists of a three-cell aerated lagoon system, with disinfection, constructed in 1998/99.

Agency Action and Applicable Regulations: The proposed action of the Department is to reissue the MPDES permit for another five-year cycle.

Applicable rules and statute:

ARM Title 17, Chapter 30, Sub-chapter 2 - Water Quality Permit Application and Annual Fees.

ARM Title 17, Chapter 30, Sub-chapter 5 - Mixing Zones in Surface and Ground Water.

ARM Title 17, Chapter 30, Sub-chapter 6 - Surface Water Quality Standards.

ARM Title 17, Chapter 30, Sub-chapter 7 - Nondegradation of Water Quality.

ARM Title 17, Chapter 30, Sub-chapter 12 and 13 - Montana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Standards.

Department Circular DEQ-12A – Montana Base Nutrient Standards

Department Circular DEQ-12B – Nutrient Standards Variances

Montana Water Quality Act, MCA 75-5-101 et. seq.

Summary of Issues: The facility must meet present permit limits for BOD₅, TSS, pH, and *E. coli*.

Affected Environment & Impacts of the Proposed Project:

Y = Impacts may occur (explain under Potential Impacts). Include frequency, duration (long or short term), magnitude, and context for any significant impacts identified. Reference other permit analyses when appropriate (ex: statement of basis). Address significant impacts related to substantive issues and concerns. Identify reasonable feasible mitigation measures (before and after) where significant impacts cannot be avoided and note any irreversible or irretrievable impacts. Include background information on affected environment if necessary to discussion.

N = Not present or No Impact will likely occur. Use negative declarations where appropriate (wetlands, T&E, Cultural Resources).

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
1. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are soils present which are fragile, erosive, susceptible to compaction, or unstable? Are there unusual or unstable geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?	[N] The Harlowton WWTF has been at this same location since 1958, when a single-cell facultative lagoon was constructed. The 3-cell aerated lagoon was constructed at the site in 1998/1999.
2. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality?	[N] Effluent limits improve discharge quality and protect the beneficial uses of the Musselshell River.
3. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?	[N]
4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be significantly impacted? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	[N]
5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[N] The Harlowton WWTF has been at this same location since 1958. Effluent limits will improve discharge quality.
6. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Species of special concern?	[N] No wetlands. No known federally listed threatened or endangered species or species of special concern present. The Harlowton WWTF has been at this same location since 1958.
7. SAGE GROUSE EXECUTIVE ORDER: Is the project proposed in core, general or connectivity sage grouse habitat, as designated by the Sage Grouse Habitat Conservation Program (Program) at: http://dnrc.mt.gov/divisions/cadd/sage-grouse ? If yes, did the applicant attach documentation from the Program showing compliance with Executive Order 12-2015 and the Program's recommendations? If so, attach the documentation to the EA and address the Program's recommendations in the permit. If project is in core, general or connectivity habitat and the applicant did not document consultation with the Program, refer the applicant to the Sage Grouse Habitat Conservation Program.	[N] The Department has verified the facility is not within core, general, or connectivity sage grouse habitat.
8. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N] No sites identified. The Harlowton WWTF has been at this same location since 1958.
9. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?	[N] The Harlowton WWTF is visible from US Hwy 12 but has been at this same location since 1958.
10. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project? Will new or upgraded powerline or other energy source be needed?	[N]
11. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
11. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[N] Effluent limits will protect public health.
12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[N]
13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	[N]
14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[N]
15. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc.) be needed?	[N]
16. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N]
17. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract?	[N]
18. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	[N]
19. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N]
20. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[N]
21. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N]
22(a). PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: Are we regulating the use of private property under a regulatory statute adopted pursuant to the police power of the state? (Property management, grants of financial assistance, and the exercise of the power of eminent domain are not within this category.) If not, no further analysis is required.	[N]
22(b). PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: Is the agency proposing to deny the application or condition the approval in a way that restricts the use of the regulated person's private property? If not, no further analysis is required.	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
22(c). PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: If the answer to 21(b) is affirmative, does the agency have legal discretion to impose or not impose the proposed restriction or discretion as to how the restriction will be imposed? If not, no further analysis is required. If so, the agency must determine if there are alternatives that would reduce, minimize or eliminate the restriction on the use of private property, and analyze such alternatives. The agency must disclose the potential costs of identified restrictions.	<input type="checkbox"/>

23. Description of and Impacts of other Alternatives Considered: None
24. Summary of Magnitude and Significance of Potential Impact: None
25. Cumulative Effects: None
26. Preferred Action Alternative and Rationale: The preferred action is to reissue the MPDES permit. This action is preferred because the permit program provides the regulatory mechanism for protecting water quality by enforcing the terms of the MPDES permit.

Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis:

☐ EIS ☐ More Detailed EA ☒ No Further Analysis

Rationale for Recommendation:

27. Public Involvement: A 30-day public comment period will be held.
28. Persons and agencies consulted in the preparation of this analysis: None

Approved by:

Jon Kenning, Chief
Water Protection Bureau

Date